



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

American School
of Classical Studies
at Athens

FRAGMENT OF A TREASURE LIST FOUND IN THE
ACROPOLIS WALL OF ATHENS

[PLATE XII]

IN the years 1896-98, during my residence in Athens as a Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies, it was my good fortune to discover nineteen Greek inscriptions of varying length and importance, which had, up to that time, escaped the attention of archaeologists, owing to their having been built into the outer face of the Acropolis wall in the course of various Roman or Turkish repairs. By dint of rock climbing and by the use of a rope ladder, lent me by the kindness of Dr. Wolters of the German School, I succeeded in getting very good "squeezes" of all of these inscriptions; and with the consent of the ephor-general of antiquities, Mr. Kabbadias, I even removed from a ruinous section of the wall two of the smaller stones, which had become dangerously loose, so that I was enabled to subject them to very careful examination and study. Both stones contain fragments of treasure lists, and are now deposited among the other inscriptions of this class in the Epigraphical Museum of Athens.

The better preserved and more easily restored of the two I shall discuss in this paper. The inscription is cut on a tablet of Pentelic marble 0.16 m. in thickness. On all sides except the left the stone has been broken away, so that it leaves a somewhat irregular parallelogram of about 0.25 m. in height and 0.22 m. in breadth. At the top a line seems purposely to have been obliterated by the scribe or by some early corrector.

For the punctuation marks (:: and :::), see Meisterhans, *Grammatik* (3d ed., 1900), p. 12.

The letters measure 0.005 m. to 0.006 m. in height and are cut *στοιχηδόν*, though not with the geometrical accuracy of many inscriptions of the same period as this. The letters are in general much obscured by being partially filled with a lime deposit from the water that has long trickled over them, and portions of the inscription could only be deciphered by the use of a sugar solution, which, as it crystallized in the very slight depressions still remaining in the surface of the stone, betrayed to a patient scrutiny the words that had become dim. While the font of type used in PLATE XII represents sufficiently well the forms of the letters in this inscription, it should be remarked that they are in general decidedly quadrate. The following characteristic forms occur, reproduced in their actual size :

Α Δ Ε Κ Μ Ν Ρ Ξ Φ Ω

TRANSCRIPTION

Imperfect and obscure letters are bracketed [].

- [τάδε ἀργυρᾶ::: πίναξ ἀργυροῦς:: σ]
 [ταθμὸν ΧΧΗΔΔΓΓΓΓΓ::: πίναξ ἕτερος σταθμὸν..... ΓΓΓ::: πίναξ ἕτερο]
- 1 ..[σ]ταθμὸν ΓΗΗΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ::: χερνιβ[εἶον ἀργυροῦν::: σταθμὸν ΧΓΓ::: χερνιβ-]
- 2 εἶον ἕτερον ἀργυροῦν::: στ[α]θμὸν Γ[ΗΗΗΗΔΔΔΔ::: οἶνοχόαι ἀργυρᾶ τρεῖς]
- 3 σταθ[μ]ὸν ΧΗΗΗΓΔΔΔΓΓΓΓ::: ο[ι]νοχόη [ἀργυρᾶ::: σταθμὸν ΓΗΓΓΓΓ::: φιάλη ἀργ-]
- 4 υρ[ᾶ]::: [σ]ταθμὸν ΗΓ::: ἑτέρα φ[ι]άλη ἀρ[γυρᾶ.....::: σταθ-]
- 5 μὸν: Η::: ἐγ κιβωτίῳ χρυσίον ἀπὸ τ[οῦ] κανοῦ ἵνα τὰ ἐλεφάντινα ζῶδια::: σ]
- 6 [τ]αθμὸν ΔΔΔΔΓΓΓΓ::: [κ]ρατῆρ χρυσοῦς [::: σταθμὸν ΧΧΓΓΓΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ::: τοῦ Ἀπόλλ]ω-
- 7 νος φιάλη ἀργυρᾶ::: σταθμὸν ΓΗΗΗ[ΗΔΔΔ::: τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἐδρία χρυσῇ::: σ]τα-

- 8 θμὸν ΔΔΔΔΓ††††|||:: [χ]ρ[υ]σίον ἀπὸ τ[ὼν ἀκρωτηρίων:: στα-
θμὸν....:: σ]τα-
- 9 θμ[ί]α χαλκᾶ Δ||:: δοκιμεία:: λείαι χρ[υ]σαῖ ἀριθμὸς ΔΔ (or Γ^ν)::
σταθμὸν (Γ^νΔΔ)ΔΓ or Γ^νΔΔΔ)ΔΓ)
- 10 |||Η:: εἴ[τ]εραι λείαι χρυ[σ]αῖ: ΔΔ|||:: στα[θμὸν τούτων ΔΔΔΔ-
Γ††††||] δοκιμεῖ-
- 11 ον τῆς οἰνοχόης [τ]οῖν θεοῖν χρυσίου ΙϚ:: δοκιμεῖον τῆς ο]ινοχόης τῆς
Ἀθ-
- 12 ηναίας χρυσίου: ΙϚ:: δοκιμεῖον τοῦ χρ[υ]σίου τοῦ ἐς τὰς φιά[λας ΙϚ::
δοκιμεῖ-
- 13 ον τοῦ χρυσίου τοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ θυματήρια: ΙϚ:: δοκιμεῖον τοῦ θ]ρόνου
οὐκ ἐπεγέ-
- 14 γραπτο οὐδέν ΙϚ:: [σ]τέφανος χρυσοῦς δ[ν ἡ Νίκη ἔχει ἐπὶ τ]ῆς κεφα-
λῆς ἡ εἴ[σ] (sic)
- 15 πὶ τῆς χειρὸς] τοῦ ἀγάλματος τοῦ χρυσοῦ [ἄστατος:: σφραγι]δίω
λιθίνω δύ-
- 16 ο τὸ μὲν χρυσοῦν ἔχον δακτύλιον τὸ δὲ [ἀργυροῦν:: μάχαιρ]α σιδηρᾶ
ἐλεφ-
- 17 ἀντινον κολεὸν ἔχουσα ταύτ[η]ν ἡ βουλὴ [ἀνέθηκεν ἡ ἐπ' Ἀντ]ιγένους
ἄρχον-
- 18 [τ]ος Μελητάδου παρ[ακ]αταθήκη:: ἀργύρι[ον ἐπίτηκτον:: β]οῖδιον
ἐλεφά-
- 19 ντινον ὃ Σμικύθη ἀ[νέ]θηκεν:: στατήρ[ες κίβδηλοι ἐγ κ]ι]βωτίῳ παρὰ Λ-
- 20 άκωνος σεσημασμένοι:: ὄνυξ [μ]έγας κ[αταεργάσ]:: παλλάδιον ἐλε-
[φάντι-]
- 21 νο[ν] ἐπίχρυσον καὶ ἀσπίς ἐπίχρυσος ὃ Ἀρχίας ἐμ Πειρα]εῖ ο[ικῶν
ἀνέθ-]
- 22 ηκεν:: χρυσῆτις λίθος ἐπὶ κίονος ξυ[λίνου:: κυνῇ χαλκῇ:: γοργονεῖον]
- 23 χρυσοῦν ὑπ[άρ]γυρον ἐπίτη[κ]τον ἀπὸ [τῆς ἀσπίδος τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔδους
ληφθῆ-]
- 24 ν:: γραμματεῖον παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς τῇ[ς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου σεσημασμέ-
νον:: θή-]
- 25 ραιον: Ι: παλαιόν:: ἕτερον [νέον θήραιον::]
- 26 ἄρχοντος:: θρόνοι με[γάλοι ||| οὐχ ὑγμεῖς, ἀνακλίσεις ἔχοντες ἡλεφαντ-]
- 27 [ωμένας εἴ]τερος θρ[όνος ἀνάκλισιν ἔχων]

I shall first make whatever comments seem necessary upon the text as deciphered and restored, and shall then pass on to a brief consideration of the probable date of the inscription and

its place among the treasure lists already published. I had already completed the restoration of ll. 14–21 before noticing that *C.I.A.* II, 2, 684, originally formed part of this stone. In restoring ll. 11–13 this fragment was of very great assistance, and it afforded confirmation of my emendations of the succeeding lines in all except one slight particular. The number of letters in each line is proved by the restorations of ll. 14–20 to have been fifty-four.

The inscription, as we have it, begins with the mention of the weight of an object of which the name is now lost, $\Gamma\text{HH}\Delta\Gamma\text{TTT}\text{III}$, *i.e.* 719 drachmae, 3 obols, and then lists two silver $\chi\epsilon\rho\nu\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, the weight of the second of which was, at any rate, more than five hundred, and less than one thousand drachmae ($\Gamma\text{TTT}\text{I}:\dots\dots$); another weight follows ($\text{XHHH}\Gamma\Delta\Delta\text{TT}\text{II}$) and then the mention of an $\omicron\nu\omicron\chi\acute{o}\eta$, probably silver, and two silver $\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota$, the first weighing 105 drachmae ($\text{H}\Gamma$).

Now these very vessels are all mentioned in four similar treasure lists¹ (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 677, II, ll. 38 sqq.; 680, ll. 4 sqq.; 681, ll. 23 sqq.; 711, ll. 6 sqq.), and we are therefore able to restore here with absolute certainty. Thus in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677, II, l. 38, we read of three $\pi\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$ the weight of the last of which ends in $\dots\Gamma\text{TTT}\text{III}$; of two silver $\chi\epsilon\rho\nu\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$ weighing 1050 and 940 drachmae respectively; of a certain number of $\omicron\nu\omicron\chi\acute{o}\alpha\iota$ of which the weight, as far as the figures that remain are visible, agrees perfectly with the weight recorded in l. 3 of the new inscription ($\text{X}[\text{H}]\text{HH}\Gamma\Delta\Delta[\Delta\text{TT}]\text{II}$); of two silver $\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\lambda\alpha\iota$; and finally of a silver $\omicron\nu\omicron\chi\acute{o}\eta$, the weights of the three latter vessels being no longer legible.

Again in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 680, the same vessels are listed, the weight of the $\omicron\nu\omicron\chi\acute{o}\alpha\iota$ being more clearly visible ($\text{XHHH}[\Gamma\text{TT}]\Delta\Delta\text{TT}\text{II}$) and agreeing well with the inscription before us.²

¹ The three $\omicron\nu\omicron\chi\acute{o}\alpha\iota$ are also spoken of in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 30; 660, l. 32; 667, l. 22; 668, ll. 1–2.

² Koehler failed to identify these $\omicron\nu\omicron\chi\acute{o}\alpha\iota$ with the three mentioned in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 30; 667, l. 22; 711, l. 7, and so supplied [$\epsilon\pi\tau\acute{\alpha}$] here and in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677, II, l. 38. Eustratiades, who first edited the latter inscription, fancied, wrongly, that he could distinguish the first and last letters of $\epsilon[\pi\tau]\acute{\alpha}$.

The weight of the second *χερμιβείον* is again given as 940 drachmae. (Cf. also *C.I.A.* II, 2, 681, l. 29.) *C.I.A.* II, 2, 681 and 711 afford little new light except that they give the number of *οἰνοχόαι* as three. From the former we learn that when that stone was inscribed both the *χερμιβεία* and the *πίνακες* had become injured (*οὐχ ὑγιή*) and in the latter, as also in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677 and 680, we see that a vacant space immediately preceded the list of these eleven utensils.

In *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 30, and 667, l. 22, the *οἰνοχόαι* are again stated to have been three in number, and in the latter the word is spelled *τρῆς*, as I have myself restored it, the more usual spelling in these lists being *τρεις*. (Cf. also *C.I.A.* II, 2, 660, l. 32, restored.) From *C.I.A.* II, 2, 668, l. 3 is derived the information that the single *οἰνοχόη* weighed 652 drachmae (*ϠΗΓϠϠ*). (Cf. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 667, l. 23 restored.)

When we see that by combining all these statements we can exactly supply what is lacking in the first three lines of the new inscription, we cannot help feeling absolutely certain of the correctness of these emendations, and can safely prefix the list of the three *πίνακες* as given in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677, II, ll. 39–41.

By the discovery of this new treasure list confirmation is afforded of the emendations already proposed by others in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 30; 660, l. 32; 667, l. 22, and especially of that of Boeckh in 668, ll. 1–3. Furthermore, we are now able to supply, in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677, II, ll. 38 sqq.; 680, ll. 5–14; 681, ll. 23–33; 711, ll. 6–13, the weight of the third *πίναξ* and of the single *οἰνοχόη*. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 681, ll. 24–33, and 711, ll. 6–7, may also be emended in several particulars by the aid of the new inscription.

Though I feel sure that the two *φιάλαι* of ll. 3 and 4 are those that are listed together as *δύο φιάλαι* in the four inscriptions cited above, I can propose nothing at all convincing with regard to the space left vacant in l. 4. Perhaps something like *ἦν ἀνέθηκεν* originally stood there. (Cf. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 654, b, l. 2, *φιάλη ἀργυρᾷ ἦν Ἀριστόλα ἀνέθηκεν*, which is, however, too short by one letter to fill the blank satisfactorily.)

LINE 5. — Next we find listed certain gold (χρυσίον), preserved in a box, but originally coming from some other source (ἀπὸ τοῦ.....). This we see mentioned in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 673, l. 26, χρυσίον ἀ[π]ὸ τοῦ κανοῦ ἵνα τὰ [ἐλεφάντινα ζῶα(?)], though it is not there stated that it was kept ἐν κιβωτίῳ. So, too, though more corruptly in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 678, A, I, l. 21, which may, however, be quite fully restored and corrected from the previous inscription and from this newly found fragment. It reads, as given in the *Corpus*, thus: [ἐν] κιβωτίῳ ἀπὸ [..... | ἐλεφ]άντιναι δια..... ΔΔΔΔ, the weight thus agreeing, so far as it goes, with the new inscription. Eustratiades seems to have made a somewhat hasty copy, for what he reads as Δ (δια) is an ω, and his α is certainly to be read as a Δ.¹ From these two passages, aided as to the spelling ζῶδια by *C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 46 (cited in footnote), we can restore l. 5 of our inscription with absolute certainty.

LINE 6. — The κρατήρ χρυσοῦς of the next line is probably the one mentioned in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 668, l. 12 κρατήρ χρυσοῦς ὁ μικρός, σταθμόν ΧΧΓΓΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ (cf. also *C.I.A.* II, 2, 669, l. 7, where the reference is, however, more fragmentary); at any rate its weight exactly fills the space left vacant between this and the next object, τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος φιάλη ἀργυρᾶ(?). By reading ἐπὶ Χίωνος (365–364 B.C.), which is supported by a very faint vertical line before the ω at the end of l. 6, we can insert the words ὁ μικρός, using the abbreviation ΞΤΑ for σταθμόν. In this case we should be forced to omit the sign of punctuation before σταθμόν, so that, on the whole, I think the reading which omits ὁ μικρός and gives Ἀπόλλωνος is to be preferred. (For the use of φιάλη ἐπὶ Χίωνος, cf. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 682, l. 9.)

In the next line (7) we may perhaps restore Ἀρτέμιδος (cf. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 683, ll. 2, 3, 9) or τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς (cf. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 701, l. 1, ll. 43–49) ὑδρία χρυσῇ. An ὑδρία(?) weighing, as here,

¹ This basket is further mentioned separately in the same inscription (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 678, A, II, l. 9) κανοῦν ἵνα τὰ [ἐ]λ[ε]φ[άν]τι[ν]α [α] [ῥ]ω[ί]α ἀστατον. (So, too, *C.I.A.* II, 2, 701, I, l. 80, and 676, l. 45 κανοῦν χαλκοῦν ἵνα τὰ ἐλεφάντινα] ζῶδ[ια].)

49 drachmae, 3 obols, is mentioned in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 716, l. 16. The restorations in these two lines are by far the most uncertain of any in the entire inscription.

The χρυσίον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων σταθμὸν.... of l. 8 is most fully described in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 698, Col. II, l. 34: ἕτερον χρυσίον ἐ[πίτηκτον ἀπὸ τῶν] ἀκρωτηρίων στ[αθμὸν.....]. Cf., however, *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677; II, l. 21, and 738, l. 7.

The next objects, σταθμία χαλκᾶ ΔII are spoken of some seven times in these lists: most fully in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 667, l. 41, [στα]θμία χαλκᾶ ΔII ἃ ὁ δῆμος σηκῶσαι ἐψ[ηφίσατο]; less fully in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 46, and 673, l. 27; and, more or less restored, in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 649, l. 23; 658, l. 7; 661, l. 3. From *C.I.A.* II, 2, 677, II, l. 28, we learn that certain σταθμία were kept in a box, [σταθ]μία τὰ ἐν τῷ [κιβωτίῳ], serving perhaps as standard weights, for in the Ὀνομαστικόν of Julius Pollux (X, 126) we read that even a hundred years later σταθμία χαλκᾶ were still among the ἀναθήματα: προσθήσεις δὲ τούτοις καὶ σταθμὰ καὶ τάλαντα, ζυγόν, πλάστιγγας, τρυτάνην. καὶ σταθμία δὲ χαλκᾶ ἐν τῇ ἐπ' Ἀλκιβιάδου ἄρχοντος (256–255 B.C.) ἀναγραφῇ τῶν ἐν ἀκροπόλει ἀναθημάτων ἀναγέγραπται.

LINES 9, 10. — Δοκιμεῖα and λείαι χρυσαῖ appear in conjunction in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 698, II, l. 26: λείαι χρυσαῖ, δοκιμεῖα, [ἀ]ριθ[μὸς] (i.e. space for from three to nine letters) σταθμὸν ΓΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ. The weight here given does not agree exactly with that in the new fragment ΓΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓ, but we may suppose the number to have been increased by one or two, and the weight by four drachmae, by the year 350–349 B.C., which is the date of the above list. It would also be quite possible to read ἀριθμὸς Γ:: σταθμὸν ΓΔΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ, thus making the proportion between the number and weight agree better with that in the case of the ἕτεραι λείαι of the next line. We should then suppose that the number and weight were reduced before the year 350–349 B.C., the former from Γ (50) to ΔΔΔΔΓΓΓ (47) perhaps, and the latter from ΓΔΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ (95+) to ΓΔΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ (89+) drachmae.

The *ἑτεραι λείαι χρυσαῖ* ΔΔΙΙΙ of l. 10 may be the twenty-three objects named at the end of *C.I.A.* II, 2, 667; for by reading *σταθμὸν τόπων* (Meisterhans, 49), which is a very common formula, especially in the mention of a second lot of utensils, we leave a vacant space which is exactly filled by the weight there mentioned (ΔΔΔΔΓΓΓΓΓΓΓΓ). These *λείαι χρυσαῖ* are probably show specimens of the weights used in the ancient loom in order to hold the separate threads of the warp tight. They may even have been used in weaving the peplos for the Panathenaic festival, and would in any case be *ἀναθήματα* appropriate to the goddess of household arts. They seem to have weighed decidedly more than the *δοκιμεία*, listed below, and to have been frequently listed with them as here. For a discussion of these *λείαι*, cf. J. G. Schneider, *Scriptores rei rusticae*, IV, p. 380, and especially Blümner, *Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern*, I, pp. 128 and 359. Evidence for the dedication of *λείαι* is to be found in the fact that rather an elaborate weight of this nature, with paintings in the red-figured style, was found in 1877 (see *B.C.H.* for that year, p. 53) near the Erechtheum, in close proximity to a vase dedicated to Athena. The cone measures 0.03 m. in height, and is ornamented with an owl on one side and a female figure (?) on the other. Pottier and Reinach, *La Nécropole de Myrina*, p. 252, reach the conclusion that such weights were frequently dedicated to goddesses. Elaborate specimens, which were found by Schliemann at Hissarlik, would probably come under this category. At Elatea one of these weights was found bearing the inscription *Θεδορίς Ἀθανᾶς*. Large numbers of a ruder sort are often found in the course of excavations. They are in the form of rough cones made of pottery, with the apex pierced to receive the thread of the warp. The fine thread of the goddess's *πέπλος* would probably not require weights heavier than two drachmae.

There may perhaps be a slight doubt about the use of these cones, but the view I have given is now generally accepted. The inscriptional use of the word *λείαι* needs emphasis.

With line 11 we reach a point where for several lines restorations can be made with much greater certainty because of the existence of the above-mentioned fragment, already published in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 684. This fragment, as emended by Koehler, reads as follows :

- Line 1 (10). δοκι[μ]εῖο[ν
 2. ο]ἰνοχόης τ[ῆ]ς ἀ[πὸ... (This we now see should be read οἰνοχόης τῆς Ἀθηναίας.)
 3. λας ι^c. (τριημιοβόλιον) δ[οκι]μεί[ον]
 4. ἀπὸ θ]ρόνου [ο]ύ[κ ἐντελ — ? (The reading should probably be δοκιμεῖον τοῦ θρόνου, οὐκ ἐπεγέγραπτο οὐδέν.)
 5. τ]ῆς κεφα[λ]ῆς
 6 (15). ἐνφ]δῖω [ἀργυρ]ῶ δ[ύο (This should certainly be σφραγιδῖω λιθίνω δύο.)
 7. ...α σιδηρᾶ
 8. Ναυσ]υγένους ἄρχο[ντος (Ol. 103, 1). (This must with equal certainty be Ἀντιγένους ἄρχοντος, as we shall see below.)
 9. β]οῖδιον [ἐ]λεφ[άντινον
 10. ἐν κ]ιβωτίῳ πα[ρ]α[καταθήκη? (Here we must read ἐγ κιβωτίῳ παρὰ Λάκωνος σεσημασμένοι.)
 11 (20). παλλάδ]ιον ἐλ[εφάντινον.

I have, somewhat prematurely perhaps, entered upon this discussion of the readings and restorations of the *Corpus*, but it seemed to me best to state at once the points upon which the new inscription casts light, and to leave the proof of the correctness of my own readings to be presented below.

In supplying ll. 11–13 this fragment came especially to my assistance, for it provided me in very full form with the terminations of these lines. When we read δοκιμεῖον τῆς οἰνοχόης τοῖν θεοῖν χρυσίου ι^c (= τρία ἡμιοβόλια) and then see that the words δοκιμεῖον τῆς exactly fill the break in l. 11, we cannot doubt that the same formula was used in the case of Athena as in that of the two goddesses, namely : δοκιμεῖον τῆς

οἶνοχόης τῆς Ἀθηναίας χρυσίου Ι^Ε. The sign that follows the 1½ obols would stand for the word τεταρτημόριον, thus making the weight of this δοκιμείον 1¾ obols instead of 1½. The usual character for this fourth part of an obol is simply the letter T. The sign here used I have never seen elsewhere. It will be noticed that in the case of these two δοκιμεῖα, as well as in that of the three following, the word σταθμόν does not immediately precede the mention of the weight. Furthermore, in the case of the first two, the reservation of the word χρυσίου till the end seems to me to be against taking it with δοκιμείον as meaning 'a specimen of the gold of the οἶνοχόη, etc.: weight, 1½ obols,' though this is certainly the construction of δοκιμείον τοῦ χρυσίου in the two following cases. I incline rather to the view that χρυσίου Ι^Ε (1½ obols of gold) is to be regarded as an appositive of the words δοκιμείον τῆς οἶνοχόης; i.e. — a testing specimen from the οἶνοχόη of Athena — 1¾ obols of gold. Against this view is, however, the fact that the word χρυσίου, even if it is to be construed with δοκιμείον, could not well have any other position than that here given it. A Greek could hardly have said, δοκιμείον τοῦ χρυσίου τῆς οἶνοχόης τῆς Ἀθηναίας, though he might possibly have said δοκιμείον τοῦ χρυσίου τοῦ τῆς οἶνοχόης. This would have been far more awkward, however, than δοκ. τ. χρ. τοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ θυμ.

LINE 12. — In the next line, after completing the word χρυσίου, we have space for nine and a half letters before the termination ΙΑΞ. These may have given a reading something like, δοκιμείον τοῦ χρ[υσίου τοῦ τῆς Δεξίλλας],¹ but it is to my mind preferable to supply the words τοῦ ἐς τὰς φιάλας, thus making this δοκιμείον more like the one that immediately follows: δοκιμείον τοῦ χρυσίου τοῦ ἐπὶ τὰ θυμιατήρια. The mark of punctuation (:) seems to be crowded in at the end of the last word (θυμιατήρια) in much the same way as after the words Ἀθηναίας χρυσίου, so that I here restore the combination of signs that occurs there, Ι^Ε, which I suppose to signify 1¾

¹ A woman of this name is stated in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 33, to have dedicated to Athena a gold seal-ring in a box.

obols. In the other three cases it is to be observed that no punctuation whatever is seen before the sign representing the weight of the δοκιμείον.

LINES 13, 14. — When we see that the weight of the next object agrees with that of the first and third δοκιμεία (1^c), we are forced here too, as in line 11, to supply δοκιμείον τοῦ, understanding the reference to be to the gold ornamentation of the chair. Even before I had discovered the connection between the two fragments, I had restored ἐπεγέγραπτο οὐδέν, in preference to reading γραπτοῦ οὐδέν; and this is confirmed by the fragment published by Koehler, for it gives exactly the right number of letters, and the top bar of the second ε is plainly visible.¹

Although these δοκιμεία are referred to in some five other inscriptions,² the references occur in such fragmentary places that nothing has hitherto been made out about them. The new inscription is important, then, as casting light upon these corrupt passages, and as giving us some idea of the size of these δοκιμεία and of the vessels that were thus tested.

Two theories may be advanced as to the use made of these δοκιμεία. They may have been kept safely under lock and key in order to be used from time to time to test the gold of which the vessels were composed, in order to see that the temple servants did not substitute vases with gold of an inferior quality; or they may have been used when the vase was first turned over by the goldsmith to test his fulfilment of the contract entrusted to him. They would then be kept as a record of the quality of the gold used, and therefore of the value of the vases. In either case a skill in getting the specific gravity of a little piece of metal weighing about a quarter of a drachma is a prerequisite of no mean importance.

¹ Elsewhere, however, the perfect ἐπιγέγραπται is consistently used in such cases; e.g. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 724, 725.

²

<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 677, I, ll. 28–34.	(Four δοκιμεία listed.)
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 678, A, III, ll. 9–18.	(Four δοκιμεία listed.)
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 701, II, l. 30.	(One δοκιμείον listed.)
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 701, II, l. 66.	(Δοκιμεία ἐν κιβωτίῳ.)
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 703, l. 15.	(Δοκιμεία ἐν κιβωτίῳ.)

We are to suppose that the *δοκιμεία* were kept properly labelled, for in the last case we are specifically informed that there was no such label attached. How it was known that this was a *δοκιμείον τοῦ θρόνου* I cannot say.

The objects that follow are mentioned in a large number of the treasure lists, and always in more or less stereotyped phraseology. I shall mention variations in the readings very briefly, laying emphasis only on such points as have to do with my own restorations.

LINES 14, 15. — The first of these, *στέφανος χρυσοῦς δν ἡ Νίκη ἔχει ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἢ ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγάλματος τοῦ χρυσοῦ ἄστατος*, is referred to in twelve more or less fragmentary places (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 649, l. 1; 651, l. 1; 652, A, l. 40; 654, a, l. 23; 657, l. 4; 658, l. 2; 660, l. 18; 667, l. 31; 674, a, l. 11; 719, l. 8; 727, l. 14; *Δελτίον Ἀρχαιολογικόν*, 1888, p. 220). The language of these inscriptions is not exactly the same in all cases. Thus, *ἄσταθμος* and *ἄστατος* each have the support of two inscriptions: *ἄσταθμος*, *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 42, and *Δελτίον*, 1888, p. 220; *ἄστατος*, *C.I.A.* II, 660, l. 19, and 674, a, l. 12. In the present inscription *ἄστατος* alone is possible. In *C.I.A.* II, 649, l. 3, for the words *τοῦ ἀγάλματος τοῦ χρυσοῦ*, which is the usual formula, we find, as here, [*τοῦ χρ*] *υσοῦ ἀγάλματος*.

It is to be noticed that an erasure of a single letter seems to have been made at the end of l. 14; to this conclusion I was driven even before I discovered the connection of the fragment published by Koehler with the inscription before us, for I could not possibly compress the five or six lines that immediately follow into the compass of fifty-three letters each. The conjecture was confirmed by the little fragment of *C.I.A.* II, 2, 684. The stone-cutter probably engraved the letters *ἐπ* at the end of l. 14 and then started in on the following line with the last letter he had cut. On discovering his mistake he deleted the first of the two letters. The reference is of course to the Victory on the hand of the chryselephantine statue of Athena.

LINES 15, 16. — The ἀναθήματα next mentioned, σφραγιδίω λιθίνω δύο, τὸ μὲν χρυσοῦν ἔχον δακτύλιον, τὸ δὲ ἀργυροῦν, are not elsewhere described in so logical a manner as here. We find indeed two formulae used, neither of which is capable of a strictly grammatical exegesis: thus in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 45, we read [δύο σφρ]αγίδε λιθίνω χρυσοῦν ἔχούσα τὸν δακτύλιον ἢ [δ' ἑτέρα ἀργυρ]οῦν, and again in 660, 21, σφραγίδια λίθινα δύο χρυσοῦν ἔχον τὸν δα[κτ]ύλ[ι]ον ἢ δὲ ἀργ[υρ]οῦν. Cf. for the first, *C.I.A.* II, 658, l. 6, and 649, l. 20, and for the second, *C.I.A.* II, 667, l. 40. Notice that the Greek spoke of a seal with a ring, not of a ring with a seal. In his concept the ring served merely as a means of carrying the seal. I may incidentally observe that *C.I.A.* II, 2, 713, end, may be exactly restored from *C.I.A.* II, 2, 660, l. 21 (thirty-four letters to the line), σφραγίδι[α λίθινα || χρυσοῦν ἔχον τὸν δακτύ (end of line) λι]ον[, ἢ δὲ] ἀ[ργυρ]οῦν], and that *C.I.A.* II, 2, 661, l. 1, [ἢ δ' ἑτέρα ἀρ]γυροῦν shows the same formula as *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, A, l. 45; 658, l. 6 and 649, l. 20.

LINES 16–18. — The next object, μάχαιρα σιδηρᾷ ἐλεφάντινον κολεὸν ἔχουσα. ταύτην ἢ βουλὴ ἀνέθηκεν ἢ ἐπ' Ἀντιγένους ἀρχοντος. Μελητάδου παρακαταθήκη, is mentioned in eight inscriptions: *C.I.A.* II, 649, l. 15; 652, A, l. 46; 658, l. 8; 660, l. 22; 661, l. 3; 676, l. 1; 714, l. 6; *C.I.A.* II, 2, *Add. et Corr.* 729, b, A, l. 5. The name of the archon occurs in two of these, so that there can be no doubt of the reading Ἀντιγένους here. (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 649, l. 17, and 661, l. 3.) It is noteworthy that in only one of these inscriptions (*C.I.A.* II, 2, *Add. et Corr.* 729, b, A, l. 5) is the fact mentioned that this was an iron knife, and in that place the adjective [ό]λοσίδηρος is used, not as here σιδηρᾷ.¹ We get from the new inscription a bit of information not given us in any of the other lists; namely, that this knife was a παρακαταθήκη of one Meletades.²

¹ In *C.I.A.* II, 2, 714, l. 6, we ought to restore the word ὀλ[οσίδηρος] in a long lacuna, and in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, ll. 1–3, since the participle ἔχουσα elsewhere always follows the word κολεόν, the reading should certainly be (as here) μάχαιρα σιδηρᾷ ἐλεφάντινον τὸ κολεὸν ἔχουσα.

² Cf. *C.I.A.* II, 2, 660, l. 22.

It seems to have been deposited by him with the senate, which dedicated it to the goddess Athena, perhaps after the death of the depositor. In no other way than this can I explain the statement that the senate dedicated this offering.

In l. 18 the break between the word ἀργύριον and the next object (βοίδιον) may be exactly filled by the adjective ἐπίτηκτον. This ἀργύριον ἐπίτηκτον is mentioned in two of the treasure lists (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 660, l. 49, and 661, l. 19), but in both cases the expression σύμμεικτον καὶ ἐπίτηκτον is used. There can, however, be little doubt that my restoration in this place is correct, though we should naturally expect the weight to be given as is the case in the second of the inscriptions cited above (σταθμὸν ΔΙΙ, παρακαταθήκη).

Another possibility is, comparing *C.I.A.* II, 2, 661, l. 20, where a number of παρακαταθήκαι are listed (-άδου Ἐρχιδῶς ἀργυρίου ΔΔΔ), and 654, frg. *bc*, ll. 3-4, to suppose that a punctuation mark was omitted before Μελητάδου παρακ.¹ and that this 'deposit' was ἀργυρίου σταθμὸν ΔΔΔ.

LINE 18. — Mention of the βοίδιον ἐλεφάντινον is made in seven passages, four times in the words βοίδιον ἐλεφάντινον alone (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 4; 654, *bc*, l. 9, in a restored passage; 661, *d*, l. 24; 667, l. 43), and three times with a lacuna of eight letters coming between these words and the words ἀνέθηκεν (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 4; 701, II, l. 51; 713, l. 16). We must in these latter inscriptions restore from here: [ὁ Σμικύθη] ἀνέθηκεν. The name Σμίκυθος is not uncommon in Attic inscriptions of this period. Σμικύθη occurs elsewhere only in *C.I.A.* IV, 2, 1296, *b*, and 2171.

LINE 19. — The next ἀνάθημα, στατήρες κίβδηλοι ἐγ κιβωτίῳ παρὰ Λάκωνος σεσημασμένοι, is mentioned four times: *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 11; 660, l. 57; 661, l. 29; 701, II, l. 59. If we were to judge simply from the wording of the inscription before us, we should suppose that these staters had been coined by

¹ I called attention above to the fact that nowhere else is the μάχαιρα σιδηρᾶ said to be a παρακαταθήκη of Meletades unless it be perhaps in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 660, l. 22, *q.v.*

Lakon, and it is true that the word *σεσημασμένοι* sometimes has that meaning. Boeckh (*Staatsh.* II, p. 231), who erroneously supplied *κατακεχυρωμένοι* (in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 11), interpreted it as 'forged by a Lacedemonian' and referred to Herod. III, 56 and Plut. *Lysand.* 18 as giving parallel cases. The word is, however, so frequently applied to objects sealed up in a box (being in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 720, B, I, l. 48 plainly opposed to *ἀνεφργμένοι*), that I prefer here to give it the meaning 'sealed.' This explanation is strongly supported by the order of the words in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 11: *στατήρες κίβδηλοι ἐν κιβωτίῳ σεσημασμένοι οἱ παρὰ Λάκωνος*. From *C.I.A.* II, 2, 701, II, l. 59, as restored by Kirchhoff, we learn that there were forty of these *στατήρες*.

LINE 20. — There follows in our list an *ὄνυξ μέγας κατεαγώς* which is referred to seven times:

- (1) *C.I.A.* II, 2, 660, l. 57, *ὄνυξ μέγας*.
 (2) *C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 18, *ὄνυξ μέγας κατεαγώς*.
 (3, 4, 5) *C.I.A.* II, 2, 701, II, l. 57; 703, l. 8; 713, l. 23, *ὄνυξ κατεαγώς*.
 (6, 7) *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 12 (in 661, l. 30 the same restored), *ὄνυξ μέγας τραγελάφου πρια[πίζοντος στα]θμὸν ΔΔΔ††*.

The next object, *παλλάδιον ἐλεφάντινον ἐπίχρυσον καὶ ἀσπὶς ἐπίχρυσος* δ' Ἀρχίας ἐμ Πειραιῇ οἰκῶν ἀνέθηκεν, is also mentioned many times. The adjectives *ἐπίχρυσος* and *περίχρυσος* seem to be used indiscriminately, though *ἐπίχρυσος* is the one most frequently used in connection with these objects. *περίχρυσος* properly means 'set in gold,' while *ἐπίχρυσος* means 'plated with gold.'

	παλλάδιον	ἀσπὶς
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 652, B, l. 17,	<i>περίχρυσον</i>	<i>περίχρυσος</i>
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 660, l. 59,	<i>περίχρυσον</i>	<i>ἐπίχρυσος</i>
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 667, l. 44,	<i>ἐπίχρυ[σον]</i>	
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 676, l. 6,	<i>[ἐπίχρυ]σον</i>	<i>[ἐπίχρ]υσος</i>
<i>C.I.A.</i> II, 2, 701, II, l. 52,	<i>[ἐπίχρυσον]</i>	<i>ἐπ[ίχρυ]υ[σ]ο[ς]</i>

C.I.A. II, 2, 713, l. 17, παλλάδιο[ν ἐλεφάντινον ἐπίχρυσον]ν κα[ὶ] ἀσπιδίσκη [ἐπίχρυσος δ' Ἀρχίας ἐμ Πει]ραι(εῖ) οἰκῶν ἀνέθη[κεν]. The term ἀσπιδίσκη is also used in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 7 and 701, II, l. 52.

This offering was made in the year 398–397, for it is mentioned in the ἐπέτεια or ‘yearly increase’ of this year (see *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652 and 660), thus giving us a date earlier than which we cannot place the inscription before us. The βοῖδιον, στατήρες, ὄνυξ, and γοργόνειον are listed among the ἐπέτεια of the year 399–398 (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, ll. 2–13).

LINE 22. — Χρυσῖτις λίθος ἐπὶ κίονος ξυλίνου. This is elsewhere spoken of but three times, and in only one case are the words given as here in full:

C.I.A. II, 2, 676, l. 9, [χρυ]σῖτις λίθος ἐπὶ κίονο[ς ξυ]λίνου.

C.I.A. II, 2, 701, II, l. 54, [χρυσῖτις λίθος ἐπὶ κίον]ος.

C.I.A. II, 2, 713, l. 21, χρυσῖτις λ[ίθος ἐπί]-
χρυσος, οὐχ ὑγής.

In the latter case the words ἐπὶ κίονος ξυλίνου would exactly fill the gap, but the adjective ἐπίχρυσος is a strange one to apply to a touchstone. It is more probable that the lacuna contained the words κυνῇ χαλκῇ,¹ to which the epithet ἐπίχρυσος is applied in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 11. The χρυσῖτις λίθος is of course the lapis Lydius, used for testing gold.

The next ἀνάθημα, the κυνῇ χαλκῇ, in both places where it occurs directly follows the χρυσῖτις λίθος. It is described as ἐπίχρυσος in the one case (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 11), and in the other (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 701, II, l. 55) there is room for the restoration of this word.

Next comes in our list a γοργόνειον χρυσοῦν ὑπάργυρον ἐπίτηκτον ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσπίδος τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔδους, which is referred to some ten times in about the same words as here: *C.I.A.* II, 2, 652, B, l. 2; 654, b, l. 7; 660, l. 53; 661, l. 23; 665, l. 11; 666, l. 11; 667, l. 45; 673, l. 1; 726, II, l. 12; 736 B, l. 3.

¹ I can suggest nothing to fill the space of six letters left in this way before the κυνῇ χαλκῇ.

The inscription in *C.I.A.* II, 2, 667, l. 45 (cf. 665, l. 11) *γοργόνειον ἀσπί]δος ἐπίτηκτ[α] ἐπάργυρ[α] σταθμὸν ΗΗΗ[Γ]* shows us that the *γοργόνειον* was of considerable weight. The *ἔδος* must be the chryselephantine statue of the goddess, but as to what is meant by the heaping up of epithets, *χρυσούν*, *ὑπάργυρον*, *ἐπίτηκτον*, I confess I have little idea. Are we to conceive of the gorgoneion as being simply gold-plated (*χρυσούν*, *ἐπίτηκτον*) over silver (*ὑπάργυρον*) or, as is perhaps less likely, as having gold hair made of snakes welded on (*ἐπίτηκτος*) to a silver gorgon's face? The adjective *ἐπίτηκτος* has both of these meanings. In any case we notice that it formed a removable part of the shield. In order to fill the gap at the end of l. 23, we may supply some such word as *ληφθέν*, or we may suppose the word *ἄστατον* to have been crowded in. Elsewhere the lines number exactly fifty-four letters.

LINE 24. — The *γραμματεῖον παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς τῆς ἐξ Ἀρείου πάγου σεσημασμένον* is mentioned six times in these treasure lists with more or less fulness: *C.I.A.* II, 2, 673, l. 2; 676, l. 12; 701, II, l. 55; 703, l. 7; 713, l. 22; 720, B, I, l. 48. In the last (which reads *γρα[μματεῖα δύο χαλ]κᾶ, τὸ μὲν σεσημα[σμένον, τὸ δὲ ἀ]ν[ε]φγμένον*) there may be no reference to the letter from the Areopagus, but as it is a 'sealed letter' (*σεσημασμένον*), I have included it here for the sake of completeness.

Θήραια are referred to but twice, *C.I.A.* II, 2, 674, l. 22, and 676, l. 43. In the latter the word *θήραια* is followed by two upright marks, indicating probably the two here mentioned. Line 25 of the new inscription ends with the letters ΘΗ, so that there can be little doubt of the reading *ἕτερον νέον θήραιον*. From Athenaeus (424F) we learn that the *θήραιον* or *θηραικόν* was a kind of *ἱμάτιον* worn in the satyric drama at Athens, and from Pollux (VII, 48) that the name was either derived from the island Thera, or was given it because the garment was woven so as to represent the skin of a wild beast (*ἥτοι ἀπὸ τῆς νήσου ἢ τὸ ὡς θηρίον ἐνυφασμένον*). Cf. Schol. Aristoph.

Lys. 150; Hesych. *s.v.* *θήραιον* (cod. *θήρεον*); Photius, *s.v.* *Θηραιον* (*sic*); Pollux, IV, 118, *Θήραιον τὸ Διονυσιακόν*. There is one other occurrence of the word in an inscription: *C.I.A.* II, 1, 374, l. 15, where it is the offering of a priestess and is associated with certain veils or *ίμάτια* made of hair (*τρίχαπτα*).

LINE 26.—*Θρόνοι μεγάλοι* ||| *οὐχ ὑγιεῖς ἀνακλίσεις ἔχοντες ἠλεφαντωμένας* are referred to five times, and in every case but one a reference to another *θρόνος* follows immediately. This is twice spoken of, as here, in the words *ἕτερος θρόνος*, with the further description *ἀνάκλινιν ἔχων* (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 673, l. 3; 676, l. 14), while in one case it is stated to be without a back (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 713, l. 8) *ἀνάκλινιν οὐκ ἔχων*. A minor verbal difference with regard to the three large *θρόνοι* is that in two cases the participle *ἠλεφαντωμένοι* agrees with the word *θρόνοι*, while in one case it agrees with the word *ἀνακλίσεις* (*C.I.A.* II, 2, 676, l. 14).¹

As is well known, the treasure lists of the fifth century B.C. and those of the fourth differ greatly both in external form and in the *ἀναθήματα* listed, very little of the gold and silver treasure of the fifth century having survived the exigencies of the Peloponnesian War. As to the arrangement of the lists, we know that in the fifth century the four colleges which had charge of the treasure during the successive years of the Panathenaic penteteris handed over to the college that succeeded them at the end of this period separate lists of the treasure kept in the Pronaos, the Hekatompedos, and the Parthenon, together with annual codicils of the objects added during the four years of their administration (the so-called *ἐπέτεια*). The treasures of the other gods seem to have been listed separately during this period (Kirchhoff, *Abhandlungen der Berl. Akad.* 1864).

In the fourth century, although the fragments of inscriptions are as numerous and as well preserved as in the fifth, the

¹ In addition to the references given above, *C.I.A.* II, 2, 674, *b*, ll. 21 and 701, II, l. 43 mention these *θρόνοι*.

arrangement is not so simple nor so stereotyped as in the previous century. It is therefore a less easy task to arrange and restore the fragments so as to obtain a complete picture of the method in use. The colleges of the treasurers of Athena and of the other gods seem first to have been united, then separated, and finally again united. Since this new inscription does not throw any light on these changes, I shall content myself with a brief statement of the results obtained by Lehner in his *Abhandlung über die Athenischen Schatzverzeichnisse des vierten Jahrhunderts* (1890), in order to show in what period the inscription probably belongs.

Lehner sees reason to place the first important change, *i.e.* the uniting of the treasures of Athena and that of the other gods, and the giving up of the penteteric arrangement between the years 407–406 and 404–403 B.C. At this time the treasure had become so reduced that it seemed unnecessary to maintain the two separate boards. During this first period, then, the treasures of Athena are listed with those of the other gods on three tablets, one containing the objects preserved in the Hekatompedos, one the objects *from* the Parthenon (*ἐκ τοῦ Παρθενῶνος*), and one the objects *from* the Opisthodomus (*ἐκ τοῦ Ὀπισθοδόμου*). The objects from these last two chambers were at that time probably also kept in the Hekatompedos. This period lasts, according to Lehner, up to 385–384 B.C. Although the new inscription dates from the period following this, it is to be noticed that most of the objects mentioned in it were listed during this first period in the treasure of the Hekatompedos; so, *e.g.*, the *τρῆις οἶνοχοαί*, as well as all the offerings mentioned in the last part of the inscription as far as the *θήραια*. Among the gods whose treasures were then catalogued with those of Athena are Zeus Polieus, *τῷ θεῷ*, Brauronian Artemis, Poseidon of Sunium and the Anakes.

In the year 385 B.C. the ever-increasing number of *ἀναθήματα* made it desirable to separate again the treasures of Athena from those of the *ἄλλοι θεοί*. But as the primary object of this separation was to provide for the listing of the new offer-

ings, it does not surprise us to find that the already existing offerings were not at once transferred to the jurisdiction of the new college. Thus in the inscription before us we find an *οἶνοχόη τοῖν θεοῖν* still listed among the treasure of Athena.

With this restoration of the treasuries of the other gods was coupled the giving up of the custom of designating from what place the object came (*ἐκ τοῦ Παρθενῶνος, ἐκ τοῦ Ὀπισθοδόμου*), for we find objects that we know to have been previously thus described now recorded together with the Hekatompedos treasure. In the inscription before us the *χρυσίον ἐγ κιβωτίῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ κανοῦ ἵνα τὰ ἐλεφάντινα ζῳῆδια* is a case in point, for we know that in the previous period this was listed as *ἐκ τοῦ Ὀπισθοδόμου* (Kirchhoff, *Sitzb. Berl. Akad.* 1887, S. 1201, n. 45).

It is to the treasure lists of this period that the new inscription bears the greatest resemblance, so that I should place it at any rate later than 375 B.C., when the treasuries were actually separated. The consistent use of O and E for the spurious diphthongs *ou* and *ei* respectively prevents our dating it later than the first half of the fourth century.

CARROLL NEIDE BROWN.

ASHEVILLE SCHOOL.

- 1 . . > T A O M O N Π H H Δ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ :: X E P N I B E
E I O N E T E P O N A P Γ Y P O N :: > T O M O N Π Γ
> T A O O V X H H H Γ Δ Δ Γ Γ Γ Γ :: O N O X O H A
Y P A :: > T A O M O N H Γ :: E T E P A Φ A Λ H A P Γ
5 M O N : H :: E Γ K I B Ω T I Ω I X P Y < I O N A P O T C
Γ A O M O N Δ Δ Δ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ :: K P A T H P X P Y < O <
N O < Φ I A Λ H A P Γ Y P A :: > T A O M O N Π H H H
O M O N Δ Δ Δ Δ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ Γ :: Y P Y < I O N A P O T Ω
Ω M : A X A Λ K A Δ I I :: Δ O K I M E I A :: Λ E I A I X
10 I I I I :: E E P A I Λ E I A I X P Y < A I : Δ Δ I I I :: > T A Γ
N T H < O I N O X O H < O I N O E O I N X P Y < I O K
H N A I A < X P Y < I O : K E :: Δ O K I M E I O N T O X P
O N T O X P Y < I O T O E P I T A O Y M I Λ T H P I A : K
Γ P A Γ T O O Y Δ E N K :: > T E Φ A N O < X P Y < O < O I
15 Γ I T H < X E I P O > T O A Γ A Λ M A T O < T O X P Y < O
O T O M E N X P Y < O N E X O N Δ A K T Y Λ I O N T O Δ E A
A N T I N O N K O Λ E O N E X O < A T A Y T I N H B O Λ H A
Γ O < M E Λ H T A Δ O Γ A P A K A T A O H K H :: A P Γ Y P I C
N T I N O N O < M I K Y O H A I T O H K E N :: > T A T H P =
20 A K Ω N O < < E < H M A < M E N O I :: O N Y < M E Γ A < K /
N O N E Γ I X P Y < O N K A I A < Γ I < E P I X P Y < O < C
H K E N :: X P Y < I T I < Λ I O O < E P I K I O N O < < Y /
X P Y < O N Y Γ Γ Y P O N E Γ I T H < T O N A P O Γ I
N :: Γ P A M M A T E I O N Γ A P A T H < B O Λ H < T H
25 P A I O N : I Γ A Λ A I O N :: E T E P O N N O H Γ
A P X O N T O < :: O P O N O I M E Γ
E T E P O < O P C

Ω 6

\ Δ Γ
 ' Γ Γ ∴ Δ Ο Κ Ι Ε Ι Ο 10
 Ι Ν Ο Χ Ο Η < Τ ξ Α
 \ Λ Λ ξ Ι Δ Μ Ε Ι
 Ρ Ο Ν Ο Ο Υ -
 Η ξ Κ Ε Φ Λ Η ξ
 Δ Ι Ω Λ Ι Ω Δ 15
 Α ξ Ι Δ Η Ρ Λ Λ Ξ
 Ι Γ Ε Ν Ο ξ Α Ρ Χ Ο
 Ο Ι Δ Ι Ο Ν Λ Ε Φ
 Β Ω Τ Ι Ω Ι Ι ' Α Α
 Ι Ο Ν Ε Λ 20
 Ε Ι Ο

(C.I.A. II, 2, 684.)